APRIL 1958

MONTHLY REVIEW

I INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

WAR-WAR *or* JAW-JAW?

EDGAR SNOW

VOL. 9
12

BEHIND THE FCC SCANDAL

THE EDITORS

Who You Are

THE EDITORS

ITORS . . . LEO HUBERMAN . . . PAUL M. SWEEZY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS

VOLUME NINE NUMBER TWELVE APRIL 1958

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: Behind the FCC Scandal 401
WAR-WAR—OR JAW-JAW? by Edgar Snow 412
WHO YOU ARE by The Editors 426
AN OPEN LETTER TO MR READERS from The Editors 432
NOTES ON THE FUTURE OF COMMUNISM IN INDIA by Naomi Mitchison 434
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 440
CONTENTS OF VOLUME NINE 447

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly and copyright, 1958, by Monthly Review, Inc.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 218 West 10th Street, New York 14, New York.
Telephone: ORegon 5-6939.
MAILING ADDRESS: 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, New York.
Address ALL communications to 66 Barrow Street.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$4; two years—$7.
By 1st class mail—United States $6; everywhere else $7.
By air mail—No. America $8; So. America $13; Europe $17; Asia $24.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

We are very happy to be able to announce that the guest of honor at MR's ninth birthday party next month will be Professor G. D. H. Cole, "grand old man" of the British socialist movement, who will speak on "Socialism and Capitalism in the World Today." Prof. C. Wright Mills will be chairman. To all teachers and students, especially those of comparative economic systems, this offers a unique opportunity to hear one of the world's leading authorities in that field. The date is May 27th (changed from the originally announced date of May 14th to accommodate Professor Cole's schedule.) For details, see the back cover of this issue.

Anne Braden's book *The Wall Between* is now in galleys and will be completed and ready for distribution early in June. We are tentatively scheduling a July publication date, after which the special publication price of $3 will no longer apply. As we have said before in these notes, we think that in some ways *The Wall Between* is the most important book that MR Press has yet published. For further information about the book, plus com-

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BEHIND THE FCC SCANDAL

There is a lot to be learned from the current big governmental scandal—they run as regularly and in about as large numbers as the shows on Broadway—but unfortunately those who are in a position to know the facts best seem least interested in helping us to find the meaning of these events. Under the circumstances, rank outsiders may perhaps be pardoned for attempting to state and analyze the real issues involved. Lack of detailed or inside information is certainly a handicap but, as we shall try to show, not a fatal one.

The story begins during last year's session of Congress when Speaker Sam Rayburn of the House of Representatives stepped down from the chair to propose an investigation of the independent federal regulatory agencies, of which the Interstate Commerce Commission, established in 1887, is the oldest and the Atomic Energy Commission the newest. It has been the subject of not a little surprised comment that Rayburn, well known as a trusty of the Texas oil and gas interests, should have initiated such a proposal. Why stir up a hornet's nest when you are likely to be the one who gets stung? Actually, there need be no great mystery. The hornets were already buzzing, and it wasn't Sam Rayburn's stirring that started them. Here, for example, is what Louis L. Jaffe, Professor of Administrative Law at the Harvard Law School and one of the country's leading experts on these matters, recently wrote about the Federal Communications Commission, the agency which at the present time is occupying the center of the stage:

> In recent months the air in Washington, New York, and Boston has been thick with rumors of political favoritism in the Federal Communications Commission. Some of them have been circulated by disgruntled losers, but the case against the FCC does not rest on them. It rests on the record of the Commission's decisions in licensing television stations, and the reactions of the bench and bar. And on the basis of this record it seems clear that the FCC is dealing a heavy blow to good government. ("The Scandal in TV Licensing," *Harper's,* September 1957, p. 77.)

Needless to say, the FCC has not been the only target of criticism. It is not so long ago that we were reading headlines about irregularities in the Interstate Commerce Commission, stock market specula-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion based on advance information from the Civil Aeronautics Board, and similar scandalous doings in others of the supposedly quasi-judicial bodies which are charged with the duty of protecting the public from the power of legalized monopoly. In a situation like this, the best defense may be a seeming offense. Or to put it another way, the best way to do nothing is to investigate. To be sure, if you want to do something you investigate too, but the hypothesis that this may have been Mr. Rayburn's intention is just a little improbable—especially in view of the way he and Rep. Oren Harris of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and another loyal friend of the oil and gas interests, went about setting up the investigation. Keeping ultimate control in his own hands, Harris appointed as head of the investigation a nonentity who had voted right (from the Rayburn-Harris point of view) on the bill to remove natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission. Everything seemed set for a long and boring inquiry in the course of which some of the minor sins of the regulating agencies could be "boldly" exposed and the major ones forgotten.

Actually, this is probably the way it will turn out anyway, but everything didn't go quite according to plan at the outset. As a result, the public has been getting a peek at some of the things behind the scenes which it probably wasn't supposed to see. The trouble started with a New York University law professor named Bernard Schwartz who was brought to Washington as general counsel to the investigating Subcommittee, appropriately and ambiguously named the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight. Professor Schwartz had been reading and writing so many books that he never had time to look into the facts of life as practiced in Washington, and when he arrived his head seems to have been full of notions of the public interest, devotion to duty, honesty, and all that sort of thing. Finding something quite different, he set out to expose and got promptly fired for his pains—but fortunately not until he had managed to leak to the newspapers enough damaging information about the FCC to make a routine whitewash impossible.

What Schwartz revealed through the leak and subsequently as a witness before the Subcommittee was that a decision by the FCC awarding a TV license in Miami to a subsidiary of National Airlines was tainted by what, on the face of it, was out-and-out corruption. The Commission's trial examiner, after lengthy hearings, had recommended that the license go to a rival candidate. The Commission, by a vote of 4 to 2, overruled its examiner and awarded the license to National. One of the majority was Commissioner Richard A. Mack, himself a Floridan. Since joining the Commission and while

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Miami case was pending, Mack had received gifts running into thousands of dollars from an old friend named Thurman Whiteside who was active as a lawyer on behalf of National's application.

In the course of investigating this case, the Subcommittee heard Messrs. Mack and Whiteside, the president of National Airlines, the unsuccessful candidate for the license, and a number of others presumed to have special knowledge of the affair. As a result, not only were the facts as alleged by Schwartz fully confirmed but also it was brought out that many others, including several members of Congress, representing both the main candidates for the license had sought to bring pressure to bear on the Commissioners. Perhaps most revealing of all, however, was that everyone, while admitting the basic facts, defended his own actions as quite legal and innocent. True, Mack conceded that he might have been somewhat careless about his financial relations with his "old friend," but he vigorously denied any wrongdoing. Why pick on us, they all seemed to be saying, we were only doing what everyone else around Washington does.

Mack's "carelessness" clearly put an end to his usefulness to the Commission—and doubtless to future aspirants for TV licenses—and he was forced to resign. But his inquisitors quickly forgave him the embarrassment he had caused them. After his resignation, he was called back before the Subcommittee for a final appearance. According to the report which appeared in the *New York Times* the next day (March 13):

> Mr. Mack was tense and pale when he took his place before the subcommittee today. But he managed a wan smile as Mr. Harris and most of the other inquiry members offered "deepest sympathy" and "best wishes."

Was the thought in each of their minds perhaps, "There, but for the grace of God, go I"? At least in the case of Chairman Harris the idea is not altogether far-fetched. For, according to a story told in *The Nation* by Roland W. May ("The FCC Inquiry," March 1, 1958), since the present investigation began, Representative Harris has thought it prudent to dispose of stock in an Arkansas TV station which recently received specially favorable treatment from the FCC.

The truth would seem to be that almost everyone in Washington these days is there for one or both of two reasons, either to latch onto valuable privileges for himself or to help someone else to get them. If the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight wants to uncover *this* sort of thing, there is every reason to believe that it can go on from now to doomsday without running out of material—and without even getting around to investigating itself.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But it is hardly likely that this is what the Subcommittee has in mind. Its new counsel, a veteran Washington lawyer named Robert Lishman who may be assumed to be passably familiar with the facts of life, was quoted in the *New York Times* (March 13) a few days after taking over as saying: "We want to carry on in an orderly fashion and close up the [Miami] Channel 10 case." At the time of writing, nothing has been said about the exact nature of further plans. Perhaps a few more of the worst licensing scandals will be aired,* but on the whole it seems likely that the investigation will now take a turn toward what the "responsible" organs of the press have all along insisted was its original purpose, namely (in the words of a *New York Times* editorial), "just how the agencies are carrying out their duties." All of the agencies were originally established by Congressional enactments which are more or less explicit about the aims they should seek and the criteria they should be guided by in reaching their decisions. These underlying charters have been elaborated into principles of policy through actual decisions, many of which have been reviewed and approved by the courts. How well (or badly) are the agencies now carrying out their Congressional mandates and living up to their own proclaimed principles? This is the type of question to which the Subcommittee can now be expected to turn its attention.

Not that anything of great interest that isn't already known is likely to be uncovered. We have already quoted Professor Jaffe to the effect that the case against the FCC rests not on political favoritism but on the record of its decisions. One might disagree with this, but it is hardly open to question that if you rule out the subject of political favoritism (and worse), there will be nothing very enlightening to add to the published record. Commissioners can be put on the stand and asked why they decided one case one way and another case exactly the opposite way—a not unusual occurrence with the FCC—but no one will be much the wiser when all the answers are in. "In our reflecting and reasoning age," Marx once said, "a man is not worth much who cannot give a good reason for everything, no matter

* For example, the Boston Channel 5 case which, according to the run of unreliable rumors, will make the Miami case look like a tea party. The Boston channel was awarded to the *Boston Herald,* mouthpiece of New England Big Business. Some indication of the kind of juicy morsels that may be yielded by an investigation of this case can be gleaned from Professor Jaffe's article quoted above: "The *Herald's* chief newspaper rival, the *Globe,* after the close of the hearing, offered affidavits of its officers showing that the *Herald* had put constant pressure on it to merge the two newspapers, and when the proposals were refused said: 'Wait until we get the television station and see what happens.' " Labor relations are apparently not the only area of American society in which threats and blackmail are used.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how bad or crazy. Everything in the world that has been done wrong has been done wrong for the very best of reasons." He was talking about night work for boys, but it applies equally well to the decisions of federal regulatory agencies.

Please do not misunderstand us. We are not arguing that nothing but political favoritism and corruption is worth investigating. The real, objective role of regulatory agencies in a private enterprise economy is well worth investigating. But Congressional committees are not likely to investigate it, and no one who counts is asking them to.

The reasons are fairly obvious when we reflect on what that role is. As good a description of it as any we have seen was given by former Governor Ellis Arnall of Georgia in testimony before the Celler Committee a few years ago. Regulatory agencies, Governor Arnall pointed out, deal only with the people they are supposed to regulate. As a consequence, "through the years, since politics cost money at the state level where they run for reelection and at the federal level where pressures are not unknown, very soon we find ourselves with an amazing situation whereby many of these regulatory bodies . . . exist not to protect the public, but to stand as a bulwark against the public to protect the people they regulate." Since Congressmen are paid for, and hence represent, the same people (and their friends in unregulated industries), and since the newspapers which make demands on Congress belong to them, it is obvious enough why no investigation of this, the really decisive, aspect of government regulation is likely to take place.

Where would such an investigation lead if it were undertaken?

As an indication, we decided to follow up a hint provided by Professor Jaffe. "Because a TV license is by its nature a monopoly, the profit is out of all proportion to the investment," he remarks in the article already cited. And in another passage he notes in passing that "not long ago a TV license was sold for over nine million dollars." Here, we thought, is a situation well worth looking into. But how to proceed? Radio and TV stations either belong to big corporations or are owned by local capitalists, and in neither case are the investments they represent or the profits they produce likely to be a matter of separate public record. Then we remembered that in most of the statutes establishing the regulatory bodies, the regulated industries are required to file regular financial data. In the case of the railroads, the ICC has long published full financial statistics. Does the FCC perhaps do the same for radio and TV? An examination of the list of publications of the FCC yielded negative results. Before giving up, however, we decided to have a look at the latest (1957) FCC annual report. And there, sure enough, tucked away in an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obscure subsection, was at least some of the material we were looking for: statistics on broadcasting revenues, costs, and income for both radio and TV. An examination of earlier annual reports showed that it had formerly been the practice to include investment figures too, but these were discreetly dropped in the 1955 report for TV (so that the last year covered was 1953) and in the 1957 report for radio (last year covered 1955).

Now we regard ourselves as hardened cynics when it comes to the profitability of Big Business. Nothing, we thought, could astonish or shock us. And yet that is just what the radio-TV data did. Have a look and see what they do to you. Table 1 presents figures on broadcasting income (that is, broadcasting revenue minus broadcasting costs) and depreciated investment for the radio industry:

TABLE 1
(Radio)

	Income (in million $) I	Investment (in million $) II	Rate of profit (percent) I ÷ II
1945	83.6	41.6	200.9
1946	76.5	56.4	135.6
1947	71.8	93.3	76.9
1948	64.1	134.7	47.5
1949	56.3	150.1	37.5
1950	70.7	151.0	47.1
1951	59.3	149.8	39.5
1952	61.1	150.1	40.7
1953	55.8	148.3	37.6
1954	42.5	145.5	29.2
1955	46.4	144.5	32.1

Two things should be noted about this table. In the first place, the 1945 figures reflect conditions prevailing during the war when there was a freeze on new station construction and an abnormally large part of advertising revenue went to radio. Hence the rapid expansion of investment in the late 40s. This tapers off by the end of the decade, however, and thereafter radio feels the bite of TV competition, accounting for the sharp drop in revenues after the 1950 peak. By 1955 the industry seems to have settled down with a total investment of a little over $140 million and an annual rate of profit of "only" about 33⅓ percent.

Table 2 gives comparable data for TV covering 1951-1953, the only three years for which they are available (prior to 1951, TV was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on a more or less experimental basis and showed losses every year; after 1953, the FCC stopped publishing investment figures).

TABLE 2

(Television)

	Income (in million $) I	Investment (in million $) II	Rate of profit (percent) I ÷ II
1951	41.6	63.2	65.8
1952	55.7	84.8	65.7
1953	71.3	175.2	40.7

Unfortunately, we don't know whether the downward movement of the TV profit rate continued after 1953. An indication that it probably did not, however, is provided by the figures for the profit *margin,* which are available for subsequent years. Table 3 gives income as in Tables 1 and 2 but compares it with total broadcasting revenues instead of with depreciated investment.

TABLE 3

(Television)

	Income (in million $) I	Revenue (in million $) II	Profit margin (percent) I ÷ II
1951	41.6	235.7	17.6
1952	55.7	323.6	17.2
1953	71.3	431.8	16.5
1954	90.3	592.9	15.2
1955	150.2	744.7	20.2
1956	189.6	869.9	21.8

Here it will be noted that the profit margin declined from 1951 through 1954 and then recovered sharply, and there is no *a priori* reason to suppose that the profit rate behaved differently. We are probably justified in assuming that on the average a TV station now returns to its owner something like 50 percent per annum on his money—and for the most desirable big-city locations, such as Miami and Boston, the rate may well be much higher.

Well, anyway you now know what all the pushing and grunting and squealing is about. The FCC is the keeper of one of the best-filled troughs that has turned up in Washington or anywhere else for a long, long time. And the hungry ones are behaving exactly as they always do when moving in for the big swill. If the Subcommittee

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on Legislative Oversight wanted to, it could, of course, provide us with more detailed and revealing statistics, and it could at the same time put what Professor Jaffe calls "The Scandal in TV Licensing" in a more accurate and intelligible perspective.

In doing so, however, it would almost certainly raise certain very awkward questions—awkward, that is, from the point of view of those who are wedded to the principle of regulating legalized private monopoly in those areas of the economy where unrestricted private monopoly is obviously out of the question. For example, what role has the FCC itself played in setting the stage for those astronomical profit rates? There is every reason to believe that it has been very substantial indeed. Those who are interested in the details should consult the excellent study of Adams and Gray:* here we can only note that just as the FCC, by its licensing and allocation policies, squelched FM as a source of competition to the Big Boys of radio, so its handling of Ultra High Frequency (UHF) has had the same effect in the TV field. Technically, there are 82 TV channels—70 UHF and 12 Very High Frequency (VHF)—but owing to the entrenched position of the VHF networks and the possession by consumers of millions of sets that are not adapted to receipt of UHF, the number is for all practical purposes reduced to 12, with a corresponding increase in the degree (and profits) of monopoly. Commodore Vanderbilt, back in the bad old days, coined the phrase, "The public be damned." We propose an up-to-date version, in the jargon of the administrative lawyers, as a motto for the FCC: "The public interest be damned."

But even this is not the most awkward question that a thorough investigation of the regulatory process would raise. The airwaves are as much a part of the public domain as the Western lands ever were. It is customary nowadays to deplore the way the public domain was alienated in the nineteenth century, and to explain the performance as due to the exuberance of national youth and the lack of governmental skill and experience. We gave to private interests an area bigger than the whole of France, it is said, because that was the only way we could get the railroads built. But if the problem were to come up now, it is either said or implied, we would of course handle it very differently.

Well, it has come up now, and so far we have handled it pretty much the same way. Only there are a few differences. In the bad old days, the little fellow used to be able to get a piece of land too; while now you needn't even apply for a piece of the air unless you have

* Walter Adams and Horace M. Gray, *Monopoly in America: The Government as Promoter*, New York, 1955, pp. 48-52.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough money to set up and operate an expensive broadcasting facility. Another difference, which you can evaluate as you choose, is that the rape of the people used to take place in the open and with little attempt to disguise what was going on; now it takes place behind the smokescreen of "regulation in the public interest."

The purpose of a real investigation would be to dissipate this nauseating fog and to show the American people precisely what is being done to and with their remaining national patrimony. And when it finished with the FCC, it would move on to the other "regulatory" swindles—the Atomic Energy Commission which is busy trying to turn the future source of mankind's power over to the monopolists; the Civil Aeronautics Board which has parcelled the airlanes out on much the same principles the FCC has applied to parcelling out the airwaves; the Federal Power Commission which is doing its best to evade any responsibility for checking the insatiable greed of the natural gas interests; the Interstate Commerce Commission which must share responsibility for the sorry state of the railroads, now in decline after an early life of unrestrained plundering. A real investigation would show up all these outfits for what they are—handmaidens of corporate avarice, figleaves to corporate nakedness.

And the remedy? In this essay we have had occasion to refer to a number of authorities critical of the present arrangement—Bernard Schwartz, ex-Counsel of the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight; Louis Jaffe, Professor of Administrative Law at Harvard; Walter Adams and Horace Gray, distinguished economists and authors of a pioneering study of the role of government as promoter of monopoly. What do they suggest?

In the case of Dr. Schwartz we can only guess, but a story which appeared in the *New York Times* on February 17th may provide us with a clue. We quote in full:

> Washington, Feb. 16—Dr. Bernard Schwartz, chief-counsel-turned-chief-witness for the Legislative Oversight subcommittee, which is investigating Federal regulatory agencies, has had a disillusioning shock over what he has learned about practical politics in Washington.
>
> As head of New York University's Institute of Comparative Law, what he taught the young about political science has proved a bowdlerized version of what really goes on, he confided last week. But, he went on, when he goes back to teaching, he will not amend his course.
>
> This is a period in life, he explained, in which young men should concentrate on the idealism in politics and public life and not have their aspirations dampened by excessive insight into the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oversights of later youth and middle age.

The counterpart of this view, surely, is that the evils from which we suffer are inevitable and the best we can do is learn to live with them. Even exposure, it seems, has its limits: too much knowledge might prematurely corrupt the young. When he was making his exit from Washington, Dr. Schwartz thundered at the wicked interests and their wrong-doing. Ivory-tower idealism never goes much further—preaching morals to the immoral. So far it has never proved effective.

Professor Jaffe, perhaps without quite realizing it, is thoroughly defeatist. Speaking specifically of radio and TV, he writes:

> There are, unfortunately, no immediate or easy remedies for the situation. The present modes of regulation and the present structure of broadcasting are powerfully entrenched. It might have been possible at an earlier time to have taxed the monopoly profits of broadcasting; to have levied, for example, an annual license fee proportional to profit, and thus to have reduced the pressures for administrative irregularity. But the enormous investments which have been made preclude such a drastic revision of the legal structure. (*Harper's,* September 1957, p. 84.)

This argument cuts very deep. "Enormous investments" have been made in all the industries subject to regulation; "drastic revision of the legal structure" is everywhere precluded. To put the same point less delicately: plunder, once organized and regulated, becomes legitimate and must be respected. The best we can do is to share out the spoils among the claimants in a judicial manner and not in accord with what Professor Jaffe calls "bureaucratic caprice." He is not very hopeful of achieving even this, however: "The challenge is a tremendous one. In our present context it will require an unwonted discipline and restraint in many quarters." But what right we have to expect such qualities at a time when "in our administrative, as in our legislative life, compromise, cowardice, and trafficking are eating away at the fabric of the legal structure," we are not told. Professor Jaffe, it seems, will finally be reduced, like Dr. Schwartz, to preaching morals to the immoral: the approach is different, the end result the same.

Professors Adams and Gray have a different remedy: competition. All our troubles, they think, have come from misunderstanding and error. But reason shows the path of wisdom and salvation:

> Government should intervene actively to maximize competition and to minimize the restrictive influence of monopoly. Especially—and this is the thesis of this book—government should

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> desist from grants of privilege that favor monopoly and jeopardize competition. If these policies were pursued vigorously and consistently the economy could be made much freer and more competitive than it now is. (*Monopoly in America,* p. 8.)

We leave aside the question whether competition really has all the sovereign virtues which Messrs. Adams and Gray attribute to it. Fortunately or unfortunately, according to your point of view, the issue will never be put to the test of experience. For there is a logic to the events which they deplore far more compelling than that of misunderstanding and error. The natural fruit of a free market is not competition but monopoly—Messrs. Adams and Gray do not deny it—and the government they call upon to redress the balance inevitably falls under the control of the huge aggregations of private wealth which monopoly engenders. If the ultimate resort of Messrs. Schwartz and Jaffe, the lawyers, is preaching morals to the immoral, that of Messrs. Adams and Gray, the economists, is preaching competition to monopolists. Neither course commends itself to the rational intellect.

This is not the place to labor the obvious moral of this story, that the proper remedy for private monopoly and fake regulation is public ownership and genuine planning. No reader who has stayed with us thus far, we are confident, can have avoided coming to this conclusion without prodding and prompting from us.

The beauty of the socialist argument today is precisely that facts make it for you. And in the long run facts are by far the best argument to have on your side.

(March 17, 1958)

We shall not note the increase of virtue so much by seeing more crooks in Sing Sing as by seeing fewer of them in the drawing rooms.
—John Jay Chapman, *Practical Agitation*

The nation's morals are like its teeth; the more decayed they are the more it hurts to touch them.
—George Bernard Shaw, *The Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet*

A straight stick makes the best cane, and an upright man the best ruler.
—Henry David Thoreau

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WAR-WAR—OR JAW-JAW?

BY EDGAR SNOW

Winston Churchill, who has a way of making his epigrams stick, has said that "We arm to parley," and that "Jaw-jaw is better than war-war." The question is, how long do we arm before we parley? We have been at it now for eleven years at a cost of close to $1,000 billion for all concerned. Yet the balance of power—and terror—is in much graver doubt than when it began. How long can we arm to parley before war-war removes the jaw-jaw alternative—and man along with it?

Within the past few weeks I have been talking to a few prominent people here and surveying opinion among civic organizations and leaders and spokesmen of both major parties. I have been interested specifically in trying to get behind the headlines into a sampling of the popular American response to proposals for a summit meeting, the banning of nuclear weapons tests, various "disengagement" formulas for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe, and other ways of promoting a thaw in the cold war.

My impression is that responsible opinion in the United States in favor of an early East-West parley for an easement of international tension has notably increased in recent months. The problem is seriously worrying people devoted to the institutions of the cold war and the permanent arms race.

It should not be supposed that those whose views are here surveyed are not well aware of the propaganda aims of Soviet diplomacy in its current initiative in demanding a summit conference. There are sound reasons for Americans to distrust Russia's maneuvers and to respond cautiously to the "peace offensive." Russia has broken many agreements made before and after World War II. Her miscalculations stemming from the Warsaw Conference of 1947, helped to initiate the cold war and the formation of NATO as much as subsequent American retaliatory moves have prolonged it.

Back of the State Department's reluctance to change the existing pattern lies the deep skepticism of a broad section of the thinking public which realizes that if the present arms competition is relaxed

---

This article by Edgar Snow, author and foreign correspondent, appears simultaneously in MONTHLY REVIEW *and several European newspapers.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anywhere there is danger that the whole fabric of Western unity may dissolve. This country cannot shift quickly from one posture to another as Russia can. Western unity thus far has been built mainly on a negative common fear of war and preparation for war. To maintain it by common economic and political planning for growth in positive ways is far more difficult. Finally, Americans have not forgotten the Hitler-Stalin Pact, which followed another prolonged Soviet "peace" campaign for an East-West "united front" against Nazism. They fear the Greeks bearing gifts of peace now, and ponder whether their ultimate goal may not be union with Germany (once Germany has been cut loose from the NATO alliance) against the West.

But so great is the fear of nuclear war now, and so widespread the belief that the Russians know the consequences as well as we do, that opinion is moving in new directions favoring a *detente* in spite of the dangers cited above. Sputniks I and II probably have played a major role in this change. These celestial demonstrations convinced the general public as well as Congress, for the first time, that America's world dominance in the field of nuclear weapons development and delivery has ended. This realization, coupled with earlier and now intensified concern about both the threat of total destruction in nuclear war and the baleful consequences to posterity of unlimited nuclear arms tests, has made far more Americans receptive to proposals for an East-West agreement based on mutual concessions and mutual compromise, than ever before.

Whether there is or is not an early summit conference, and whether its results are positive or negative, propaganda in favor of "jaw-jaw" is having its effect. It will be reflected in the national elections next November. It may become a major issue in the presidential campaign of 1960. For the first time in many years the underlying premises of American foreign policy are being re-examined.

Perhaps only a major provocation or act of aggression coming from the Communist side of the world could now entirely arrest this trend.

Broadly speaking, the groundswell of opinion in favor of a limited *detente* with the East arises from two sources. First, there is a small but growingly organized popular demand, not much reflected in the press reports, for an end to nuclear tests, for control of nuclear weapons, for pooling of the world's scientific knowledge, and for joint explorations of outer space. These objectives are the common aim of a modest crusade launched by (1) the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, which is sponsoring a campaign of letter-writing to the White House; and (2) a group of a dozen or more churches and anti-war organizations now engaged in mass circulation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of another petition to the President originated by the American Friends Service Committee of the Quakers.

Second, paralleling these activities (and many smaller peripheral group and individual efforts) there is an important minority in both houses of Congress which is deeply dissatisfied with the results of United States foreign policy. They consider that it has fallen into a static negativist posture due to past and present overemphasis on military "containment" measures which have failed to cope with the new Communist strategy of peaceful penetration abroad by cultural-economic means under the slogans of "competitive coexistence." Prominent in this group in the Senate are Hubert Humphrey, an important weathervane figure in the Foreign Relations Committee, William Fulbright, and Mike Mansfield, who is believed to favor some of Harold Stassen's views on nuclear disarmament. In the House, thirty or forty younger representatives back Humphrey's demand for a major re-study of both American nuclear and foreign policies. They favor a phase-by-phase approach to agreement with the East and a realistic re-planning of American foreign aid programs to meet the latter-day Soviet trojan-horse strategy of making friends and influencing neighboring states.

Within the past year, one man has come to personify both the unofficial and official feeling that something must be done immediately to exorcise the frightful menace of nuclear war and to revise an American foreign policy based on the assumption that Soviet Russia is preparing for a military conquest of the world. This man is George F. Kennan. Chief of the planning section of the State Department in the early days of the cold war, and later American ambassador to Russia, Kennan is credited with authorship of the original thesis of the "containment policy." Since John Foster Dulles let him out of service, in 1953, he has become an increasingly influential critic of United States policy. For several years, Kennan has been perfecting his own ideas for an East-West "disengagement" program in Europe, similar to the proposals put forward by Adam Rapacki, Polish Foreign Minister. Last year he summed them up in his famous Reith lectures, later broadcast over the BBC and recently published as a book.

Briefly, Kennan believes that his original conception of "containment" was grossly distorted in its application by the Pentagon chiefs. They greatly overstressed the military danger from Russia. Administration officials overlooked the importance of basic, serious, and persistent efforts to reform and improve the democratic societies of the West themselves, according to Kennan. He believes the Soviet threat was never primarily one of military aggression, and that the Western

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nations now have more to gain than lose by a mutual withdrawal of Soviet and American forces from Germany.

"Mr. Kennan has done an important thing," James Reston wrote in reviewing Kennan's book, *Russia, The Atom, and the West,* in the *New York Times* (March 2, 1958). "He has started a debate and we haven't had a good debate on the assumptions of our foreign policy for years. Even cold wars become familiar and, to officials, even comfortable after a while. Anybody who asks basic questions and provokes serious men to think performs a public service."

Kennan's criticisms have been sharply attacked by Dean Acheson, President Truman's Secretary of State and Kennan's former chief. He urged the Democratic Party policy committee to join him in repudiating Kennan. But the event showed that while Mr. Dulles supported Acheson, the Democrats were divided, and the party policy committee avoided any reference to the Acheson-Kennan dispute. Harry Truman did back Acheson, but Adlai Stevenson, nominally head of the party, has remained silent, as has Eleanor Roosevelt. The reason for this is not because the Democratic party as a whole is ready to call off the cold war. The reason is that election is coming up in November and the "new approach" may be a key issue. Congressmen are beginning to realize this from their daily mail.

It is against this general background that the various opinions here summarized must be weighed.

The significance of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy is not negligible. Its basic aim, which is to end nuclear weapons tests as an immediate step toward disarmament, is contrary to the elaborate "package deal" dear to Mr. Dulles. Although not as influential as its counterpart headed by Bertrand Russell in Britain (the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament), the CSNP's following is surprisingly broad, for this country, if still numerically small. It is non-party and non-partisan. As such, it is free from political "taint" or bias associated with left-wing peace propaganda favoring Russian maneuvers.

The sponsors of CSNP include impressive figures in business, professional, and labor circles, in the arts, the sciences, and education. One of its founders is Eleanor Roosevelt. Among other committeemen are Walter Reuther, Vice-President of the AFL-CIO; Clinton Golden, another important labor leader; Elmo Roper, leading opinion analyst; Dr. Martin Luther King, an outstanding Negro leader; Norman Cousins and Harold Fey, well-known and widely respected editors; John Hersey, Oscar Hammerstein, Lewis Mumford, and other authors and writers; educators and scientists such as Dr. Stanley Livingston, James T. Shotwell, Pitirim A. Sokorin, Dr. Hugh Wolfe;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

businessmen such as Lawrence S. Mayers, Jr.; and many prominent church leaders.

Thousands of petitions circulated by the CSNP are being forwarded daily to the public and ultimately to the White House, urging that the President go before the UN and propose:

> That nuclear test explosions, missiles and outer-space satellites be considered apart from other disarmament problems;
>
> That as there is now agreement in principle on the need for supervision and inspection necessary to verify a cessation of tests, all nuclear test explosions by all countries be stopped immediately and that the UN then proceed with the mechanics necessary for monitoring this cessation;
>
> That missiles and outer-space satellites be brought under United Nations-monitored control, and that there be a pooling of world science for space exploration under the United Nations.

Organized in New York only last November, the CSNP has raised money to carry this message in full-page advertisements in 35 papers across the whole country. Branch committees now exist in 60 major cities and still more are being formed. A legislative committee works at the Congressional level and has hopes of bringing a resolution before the present session of Congress in support of its position.

All this I learned from Trevor Thomas, executive secretary of the CSNP, who said: "This is the biggest popular anti-war movement seen here in years." He went on: "We are not exactly on the crest of a national wave by any means. But we have been able, and are the only organization that has been able, to collect under one umbrella fairly broad cross-sections of leadership from various sectors of the American community—labor, religious leaders, writers, actors, scientists, the disciplines, and so on."

"Would it be correct" I asked, "to imply that support for the Sane Nuclear Policy Committee means support also for the proposed heads-of-state meeting, and for action looking toward disengagement policies, as opposed to the Rockefeller Brothers' report and Dr. Teller's advice to devote increasing billions for an endless competitive race in nuclear weapons and defense against them?"

"In general, the sentiment with us is all in that direction," said Mr. Thomas. "We certainly want to break the ice of the cold war. But we do not commit members to anything so specific as the Rapacki Plan. Obviously, the banning of nuclear tests means a stage-by-stage approach to disarmament, however. It means negotiating at high levels, in cooperation with the UN for halting the arms race."

Mrs. Roosevelt was a prime mover in the CSNP. She also replied,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in answer to my questions, that she "definitely favors an early East-West meeting." Support for negotiating in the UN does not rule out a heads-of-state conference. She also unqualifiedly endorsed *bilateral* agreements to ban future nuclear weapons tests. As for the proposed "disengagement," either in terms of the Rapacki Plan for denuclearization of both Germanys along with Poland and Czechoslovakia, or of Kennan's version, she still remains uncommitted. In this she reflects the Democratic party policy-makers at the present time.

It may be taken for granted that most American scientists who signed the UN petition calling for an end to nuclear tests also endorse the CSNP's position. It was Dr. Linus Pauling of the California Institute of Technology who presented that petition, on behalf of 9,233 scientists. He has given me the following statement:

> I favor agreements about disarmament and the solution of international problems by peaceful methods going far beyond agreements to stop bomb tests, which I think of as [only] the first step. I propose that there be formed immediately great teams of scientists and other specialists from all leading nations to analyze the problems thoroughly, with no power to determine policy, but with the goal of finding safe and just solutions for consideration by the nations of the UN.

Dr. Pauling's views are roughly the same as those of a majority of American physicists, including Harold Urey and Robert Oppenheimer. Against him is found the minority view held by Dr. Edwin Teller and scientists closely associated with the nuclear weapons program of the United States. Dr. Teller's contentions (recently publicized in *Life* and over national television hook-ups) are basically that the dangers of radiation and fallout have been greatly exaggerated. Tests must continue in order to produce a "clean" bomb and more effective tactical nuclear weapons. Russia cannot be trusted to abide by any agreement. Dr. Teller speaks with the backing of Pentagon officials, right-wing Congressional circles, and as a consultant for important nuclear-weapons concerns such as Convair and the General Dynamics Corporation. His views are thus more weighty than his support among scientists might suggest.

"We have no indication, however," said Trevor Thomas, "that Dr. Teller's counter-offensive against the work of the CSNP is having any effect as yet, despite the wide publicity that has been given his opinions intended to reassure the public's fears about nuclear tests."

The petition campaign launched by the American Friends has the support of organizations whose associates probably run into the millions. It cannot be underestimated among factors now reviving "debate on the assumptions of our foreign policy." Quaker leadership

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assures that this debate can go on in an atmosphere relatively free from the McCarthyist "fallout" which in the past has made objective public discussion of key issues in our problems of coexistence with the Communist-ruled powers virtually impossible.

Considering the fact that the Quakers' petition to the President calls for a *unilateral* cessation of nuclear weapons tests by the United States—as contrasted to the bilateral agreement proposed by the CSNP—the response to their brief campaign is impressive. "It is our belief," said Mr. Norman J. Whitney, director of the national campaign, "that whatever power first takes this step would gain a distinct moral victory. World opinion and the propaganda impact would quickly oblige the other nuclear powers to follow suit."

The Quakers' petition crusade is led by eleven branch offices working with Congregationalist, Methodist, Baptist, Mennonite, and other organized church groups as well as anti-war and pacifist leagues of long standing. Mr. Whitney tells me that "hundreds of local churches" of many denominations are showing "an enthusiasm never seen before." Up to March, 162,000 petitions had been accepted, each providing for 20 signatures. Circulation was begun only two months ago, but completed petitions bearing 35,000 signatures had been delivered to the White House by the end of February.

"Whole congregations [of local churches] have signed the petition," Mr. Whitney says. "Other petitions have been circulated door to door, or on street corners. We have thousands of volunteers now. Though the press gives little space to the many meetings and discussion groups being held throughout the country, the sentiment is mounting in our favor."

Associated with the Quaker petition is another organization called Non-Violent Action Against Nuclear Weapons. Momentarily its chief activity is backing an unusual venture intended to dramatize the issue in a way that may yet make world headlines but has so far been almost ignored by the United States press. This is the voyage of the sailing vessel *Golden Rule* under Albert Bigelow, a World War II naval commander, who is soon to be en route to Eniwetok Island. He intends to keep his boat in the area designated by the United States for nuclear explosions on a large scale scheduled for April.

A few weeks ago Commander Bigelow went to Washington armed with a letter on which he had 17,000 signatures calling for a ban on nuclear bomb tests. For ten days he waited to see Mr. Eisenhower for whose election he had worked as a regional campaign leader. He was never able to meet the President or any of his cabinet or even a secretary's secretary. He then came to the decision to take the *Golden Rule* out in order to deliver the protest, in action, which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he was not permitted, as the representative of 17,000 voters, to leave with any responsible person in the White House.

If Commander Bigelow adheres to his purpose, and if the domestic press chooses to feature the drama, his intrepid adventure might make as great an impact on the American and world conscience as Mahatma Gandhi's non-violent civil disobedience campaigns of the past. For the American naval authorities to seize Bigelow and his ship and crew to put them out of danger, would amount to piracy on the high seas. Government lawyers have been searching for a way to handle the *Golden Rule* situation. Justice Department officials admitted, however, when questioned on February 25, that they knew of no legitimate way to bar him from the atomic proving grounds.

Generally speaking, the mass circulation media support the State Department in its opposition to high-level conferences on the questions discussed here until they have been tied in packages not easily or quickly broken up. Exceptions are those liberal editors who now advocate bilateral banning of nuclear tests as part of an agenda to be agreed upon in advance of a summit meeting. Relatively few openly accept the Kennan or Rapacki approaches of "disengagement" in some form. Those who do so may reflect popular opinion more than the conservative press, which seems far behind mass acceptance of both ideas at this moment.

The editor of America's oldest liberal weekly, *The Nation,* Carey McWilliams, wants an early East-West meeting, favors a ban, unilateral *or* bilateral, on nuclear weapons tests, and a break-up of the cold war tension by some serious consideration of the Rapacki proposals.

"I do not oppose nuclear bomb tests strictly on sentimental or humanitarian grounds," said McWilliams. "Conceivably the danger is not any greater than Dr. Teller makes out. But I oppose bomb tests because they are in themselves premonitory acts of war."

McWilliams believes that once an agreement were reached on bomb tests and a system of disengagement with adequate inspection established, we could proceed at once to establish broad cultural and economic contacts with the East. He would trade not dozens but hundreds and thousands of students, scientists, and technicians.

"We need something like an exchange of hostages," he suggests, "which worked well during medieval times." In general the aims ought to be as broad as the peace program recently advocated by Professor C. Wright Mills in the *Nation's* columns—unqualified acceptance of the challenge of competitive coexistence, with arms expenditures on both sides siphoned into creative and peaceful purposes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of world development. Professor Mills, whose *Nation* proposals have evoked widespread response in liberal circles, concedes that it would be Utopian to expect the United States to proceed unilaterally, however, and is realist enough to accept banning of tests and disengagement proposals as steps in the right direction.

Lewis Mumford, an initiator of the CSNP petition, has for some time been opposing the sterile aims of the cold war in favor of some kind of basic *detente* with the East. One of America's most distinguished men of letters, he has very broad connections among both those engaged in social planning and among private groups sponsoring discussion of foreign policy, such as the Council on Foreign Relations.

"In terms of ultimate biological survival," says Mr. Mumford, "the real interests of the Russian people and the American people are at one with mankind. That is the one saving feature which permits a gleam of hope. In the swift recognition of this inescapable fact lies the only exit from the tomb we have been preparing for mankind."

Another indication of the deepening demand for a halt in the arms race, among intellectuals not usually concerned with political issues, is the support given to CSNP proposals by one of America's best-loved humorists and editors, E. B. White of *The New Yorker*.

James P. Warburg, as a former United States government official, an author, independent critic, inveterate letter-writer and pamphleteer, whose analyses have often influenced thoughtful and liberal Congressmen, represents another view worth noting. Coming from a noted banking family and himself an independently wealthy financier, Mr. Warburg is well known for his anti-Communist position in the past. His criticisms of American cold war policy are strictly pragmatic. They happen today to be not far from views expressed by men such as Ex-Governor Chester Bowles, our former ambassador to India, by Walter Millis, for many years the N.Y. *Herald-Tribune's* editorial writer on foreign affairs, and retired General Hugh B. Hester (who supports the CSNP), as well as by many less prominent speakers, writers, and educators around the country.

Mr. Warburg told me that he favors an early East-West Conference to discuss an agenda including both the ban on nuclear tests and some form of disengagement in Europe and Asia. "The Russians have already agreed to the ban in principle, and with inspection. We have not. Even without an agreement, whichever side first announced a cessation would succeed in making it general and win the moral credit."

"The Rapacki plan in itself may not make much sense," he went on, "but in connection with the Soviet proposal of November 7,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1956, it makes a lot of sense. That was for a phased withdrawal of Russian and American troops from Europe. If in 1956 we said no to the Russians because we could not give up our positions of superior strength, and now we say no to Rapacki and Moscow because, as Dean Acheson insists, we cannot negotiate from weakness, when if ever will we negotiate? We must go along with them now, or offer counter-proposals, or continue to lose the diplomatic and propaganda initiative to the Russians."

Mr. Warburg observes that the Western powers, by trying to salvage the status quo instead of taking the initiative in negotiating realistically, are steadily sacrificing their bargaining positions as, one by one, events diminish the extent and range of their influence, in Europe, in the Middle East, and above all in North Africa.

"It makes no sense whatever to cling to a slowly sinking ship without even manning the pumps," says Warburg, "in the Micawberish hope that our adversary's vessel may strike a rock and be the first to founder. The Russians have no troubles comparable to ours in Algeria, Cyprus, and Taiwan. They can afford to wait, so long as we fail either to strengthen our positions or take the initiative." He makes these suggestions: French grant of independence to Algeria and the return of her troops to NATO; direct, high-level negotiations with Peking for a Korean settlement; Soviet-American negotiation for an arms embargo and hands-off agreement in the Middle East, for phased disengagement in Europe, and for "an unconditional monitored ban of nuclear test explosions."

Capitalist Warburg is under no delusion that any such "sane policy" will be followed, and his pessimism is echoed by Paul Sweezy and Leo Huberman, independent socialists. Both the latter have spoken, as editors of MONTHLY REVIEW, quite positively on all these questions of cold war and the need to liquidate it. With the nearly total disintegration of the American Communist Party, which years ago ceased to have any significant intellectual influence here, the Sweezy-Huberman viewpoint is more valuable than its limited recognition suggests. The synthesis of their analyses, one a trained economist, the other a trained economic historian, and both non-party Marxist scholars of durable integrity, may come close to expressing what remains in this country of pragmatic socialist thought and its influence in labor and the middle class.

In their February issue of the REVIEW they assessed the connections between the current business slump and the cold war and the prospects of a *detente,* to reach conclusions not very encouraging for those who believe public opinion can still apply a brake to the arms race. "We see no reason to assume that the ultimate resort

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of American capitalism in trouble will be different from what it has been throughout the postwar period, namely, a massive increase in military and related cold-war expenditures," they wrote.

The editors of the REVIEW are convinced that the United States "power elite" cannot abandon the device of the subsidized arms market as the only "way out" of depression. They are deeply skeptical that even if a summit meeting were held it would bring any major change in this respect. Basically, they seem to regard the Communist emphasis on military economy as purely a response to a Western threat rather than as part of an interplay of rivalry for dominance and spheres of influence on familiar lines of power politics. Western capitalism fears more than anything else, and will desperately try to avoid, steps toward a *detente* which would sharply reduce arms expenditures here, to accept the terms of economic-political-cultural "competition with a more rational social order, one that is well provided with standards for using whatever surplus can be produced."

Whether "capitalist irrationality" will continue to be so hamstrung by laws which, as Sweezy-Huberman believe, condemn it to "the only form of waste which [free enterprisers themselves] find acceptable, the suicidal one of stepped-up preparations for a war of atomic annihilation," remains the dreadful enigma yet to be resolved.

In concluding this summary, two facts about America ought to be stressed.

First, this is not the world of 1929, 1939, or 1949. It is now a world about evenly divided between nations with unplanned capitalist economies on the one hand, and wholly planned or partially planned socialist or semi-socialist economies on the other hand. It is also a world in which both capitalists and socialist leaders are, alike with ordinary men, doomed to perish on an earth reduced to a dry and dusty cinder if there is another major attempt at "conquest of power" by either side in nuclear war. The development of a Soviet military economy with all its consequences in terms of Stalinism was in part a riposte to the capitalist attempt to encircle socialist planning in a single (large) country. The next stage of Western capitalism may take a new and unique form as a result of the attempt to encircle and destroy it and its institutions, now being made in novel and unexpected ways by a number of socialist states.

Behind the rivalry of the Soviet Union and the United States for dominance in the world market—with ideas as well as things—there is of course always one underlying long-range question of great magnitude. The appearance of sputnik over our once-sovereign skies had dramatized it in a far more vivid and urgent sense than ever

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before. The administration, Congress, and Big Business do not speak of it, but increasingly it troubles the best and most thoughtful brains (and there are some very good ones) in all areas of leadership whenever there is any serious threat of a substantial withdrawal of state subsidy for war production on which our economic stability, in a society of conspicuous waste, has heavily depended for nearly twenty years. That question is, of course, whether it is any longer possible for the old unplanned, uncoordinated, undirected private-profit motivated economies to compete successfully, in the production of useful goods and services, against wholly planned socialized economies (in China as well as Russia) which have moved forward over recent years at three to four times the pace of the United States—in the past three years five or six times as fast—and at present are more than doubling that rate in contrast to an American production in sharp decline. "The recession is creating a mounting uneasiness among United States officials concerned with the economic race between the United States and the Soviet Union," reported the *New York Times* in a small item buried in the back pages on March 3rd. And it went on to say:

> They suggest that declining production in this country and mounting Soviet output may be reducing the United States lead over the Soviet Union to the lowest in history. In the first quarter of this year, for example, the estimated Soviet steel production of 14,000,000 tons may amount to 70 or 75 percent of the output here. . . . Similar comparisons can be made in oil and coal production, both of which have been declining here. In the case of coal, continuance of the trend for several more months may put Soviet coal production ahead of the United States for the first time.

A second phenomenon is the surprising weakness of the counter-attack, thus far, against all the opinion I have cited in favor of a "re-study" of the basic assumptions on which America has conducted its side of the cold war. Not only are the advocates of the strictly military answer now found in a distinct minority, along with believers in the pursuit of the chimera of "positions of superior (nuclear) strength," but nobody of intelligence here any longer supposes, as Mr. Dulles solemnly advised the United States Congress only two years ago, that the Soviet system "is on the point of bankruptcy," and "about to collapse," or that the Chinese revolution is "merely a passing phase."

Some of those who most ardently supported the cold war on premises such as those, have recently expressed themselves in favor of negotiation on the basis of realistic or *de facto* situations. Not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

least among these is General Omar N. Bradley, former chief of staff of the United States Army, beloved by both Big Business and the public at large. He is perhaps the first of the Pentagon "elite" to admit that the objectives of the cold war, as formerly conceived, cannot be attained.

"World leaders must start right away to work out a peaceful accommodation of the conflicting forces that would lead to war," he said last January. "We can waste no time in getting started on negotiations to end the threat of [nuclear] war." Chided by Pentagon officials for allegedly "pacifist views," he made a statement to emphasize that all moves toward disarmament and "accommodation" must be bilateral. He did not, however, give up his basic demand for a negotiated step-by-step withdrawal from positions likely to lead to a universal disaster.

Earlier I referred to Democratic Senator Humphrey. He favors banning of nuclear weapons tests, and a new approach to East-West rivalry based on realistic re-study of Western strategy. In the significant part of his Senate speech in February, Humphrey said:

> What seems necessary at this point if we are ever to reach a real and genuine first step agreement with the Soviet Union is to be willing to break up the disarmament package. We should be prepared to negotiate on each of [Mr. Dulles'] nine points separately. . . . I must emphasize here that it is Utopian to expect to reach comprehensive agreements with the Soviet Union on any matter. To think we can obtain them on the most sensitive aspects of their and our national security is deceiving the American people as well as the entire world.

Senator Humphrey's speech did not command any wide audience among his colleagues. Many liberal Democratic Senators left the floor during his presentation. The vanguard of change is always small in Congress, and on a matter so sensitive as an "accommodation" to the Russian viewpoint on an approach to a *detente* it is negligible indeed. The press gave Humphrey's remarks relatively scant attention, but their purport reached the grass roots, and percolated. Humphrey says that the mail response from voters was the heaviest he has had in years. He seemed well satisfied.

On a recent speaking tour I myself heard Senator Humphrey's speech quoted with approval. My own primary school principal, now over 70, and famous in Missouri where she was a pioneer in introducing many progressive educational methods, wrote to me recently: "I no longer care very much who is right or wrong in the ideological struggle back of the nuclear bombs. We are all equally doomed if there is nuclear warfare. I did not spend a lifetime teaching children

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to grow up to poison the world and deprive future generations of the chances we have had. I would be in favor of negotiating with the Devil himself to bring an end to the senseless race to arm for a war in which only Death could win and mankind only perish."

Senator Humphrey is a man with a keen scent for a change in the prevailing winds. He is not an altruist nor a man who quickly leaps into an unpopular position. In the past a fervent supporter of the "rollback" aims of the cold war, his present "revisionist" talk is significant. He may be assumed to be, along with the minority of Senators who seriously concern themselves with foreign policy, in closer touch with changing sentiment around the country than Mr. Dulles. Few in number though Senators now openly voicing sympathy with Humphrey may be, their attitude will in any case be a dominant, if not decisive, factor in determining policy for a Democratic administration.

The logic of this summary indicates to me that if the Russians want a summit conference, and wish a phased mutual withdrawal from positions of terrifying danger, they can probably get it. If they wish to convert the cold war into a battle of competitive existence in a world free of the menace of sudden lethal attack from either side, they can probably get that, too. But if their tactics reveal that all they wanted was a glad-hand meeting such as Geneva, and the "summit" attained proves to be only a false promise, with far vaster peaks of arms competition lying still ahead, the outcome may be much more serious for everybody. The voices now being strongly heard here in favor of reason might then be submerged for a long time to come.

America is at a crossroads now, facing mounting difficulties in both internal economic and external political problems. The odds probably are that the "power elite" would on the whole prefer "a massive increase in military and related cold-war expenditures," as a "way out" of both difficulties. But the American man in the street is not yet a total cipher. Russia at the moment seems to have an extraordinary degree of initiative in offering him—and the whole world —a practicable alternative. If, this time, it is thrown away, the opportunity may never arise in such hopeful terms again.

We can and should negotiate with the Russians, but it must be—as it has never been since 1945*—a genuine negotiation in which we are no longer looking for the ultimate destruction of an enemy but for accommodation with a rival in a situation in which the survival of both is actually more to the advantage of each than the destruction of either would be.*

—Walter Millis, *New York Times Magazine,* February 2, 1958

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHO YOU ARE

BY THE EDITORS

With our November 1957 issue we enclosed a questionnaire designed to give us a picture of MR readers. The first thing we learned is that you are a wonderfully responsive group—more than one in every four replied. A 25 percent response to a "no-offer" questionnaire is "unheard of," we were told by a leading trade journal in the publishing field. The sampling is thus unusually large and a check of its geographical distribution shows that it closely follows our circulation pattern.

We can't give you an authentic close-up of the average reader because there isn't any average reader. But by putting together the highest percentage groups in the various categories we come up with this composite portrait:

Mr. MR is a professional man, probably a college teacher, 31 to 50, earning between $3,000 and $7,000 a year. He has done graduate work and belongs to several professional societies. He looks forward to MR each month and dislikes mostly the facts that it isn't longer and isn't a weekly. After reading the magazine (generally from cover to cover) he passes it on to wife or friend. He prefers articles on foreign affairs but is also keenly interested in economic and social theory. Of the 13 MR Press books listed in the questionnaire, he has bought from one to six titles. He would like to have a regular book section in the magazine but not by sacrificing other material.

He was introduced to MR by a friend in its beginning years. Most of the other journals he reads are left of center, although he subscribes also to magazines like *The New Yorker, The Saturday Review, Consumer Reports,* and *Scientific American.*

His counterpart in foreign countries has a much lower income but is largely the same type of person.

So much for the composite reader. The returns in detail give a much fuller, more accurate picture. A summary of the most revealing items follow.

Who Reads MR?

MR readers hold as many different jobs as the census enumerates. High on the list, and in this order, are: the academic fraternity (pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fessors, teachers, students), retired people, housewives, lawyers, office workers, salesmen, laborers, engineers, scientists, social workers, doctors, economists, writers (including newspapermen, editors, and publishers), skilled workers, miscellaneous business employees, and labor union officials.

We were delighted to find a tugboat captain, a yacht designer, a gandy dancer,* a bevy of lumberjacks, fishermen, farmers, and one subscriber who wrote "landlord"—matched by another who simply described himself as "vagrant."

It was an agreeable surprise to learn that 15.4 percent of our readers are below 30 years—roughly the same as the percentage above 65. By far the largest group, 45 percent, is 30 to 50, and 22 percent is between 50 and 65.

In capitalist society people are quick to tell you about their marital relationships, political beliefs, and everything else—except their incomes. No less than 92 percent of our correspondents, however, answered our brash inquiry on income. One reticent exception said: "God should know, but if he doesn't, all the better. In any case, God will never tell anybody, including the Treasury Department." Our final tabulation showed this distribution among income groups:

$ 0 to $ 2,999	21%
$ 3,000 to $ 6,999	41%
$ 7,000 to $11,999	20%
$12,000 and over	9%
No answer	8%

Compared to the distribution of income in the population as a whole, MR readers do very well, with a smaller percentage in the lowest bracket and a larger percentage in the top group. As was to be expected, those in the lowest category are primarily the oldest and youngest readers, with 58 percent of those 65 and over, and 37 percent of those under 30 years, earning less than $3,000.

As with income, so with education. Roughly 20 percent of the United States population have a college background; but among MR readers the proportion is 72 percent, and 42 percent have attended graduate school. For the editors this is a startling—nay, frightening—fact.

Seventeen percent of our readers belong to labor unions, and 45 percent belong to one or more professional organizations. There is some duplication, especially with teachers. Correcting for the overlap,

* We have always thought a gandy dancer meant a railroad section hand, but Mencken's dictionary defines the word as "a seller of cheap novelties."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we find that 52 percent of our readers belong to unions or professional societies or both—a figure large enough to make a Madison Avenue devotee of the group-leader theory drool copiously.

These, then, are the people who read MR. But more than half have wives, husbands, children, friends, inamoratas, and inamoratos to whom they pass along the magazine. One particularly peripatetic copy in Alaska goes to 15 readers. Just under 40 percent of the copies have two readers, 20 percent have three, 5 percent have four, 2½ percent have five, and 1½ percent have six. One Canadian subscriber and one United States subscriber reported 10 readers. The number of readers in college and public libraries can only be guessed. As nearly as we can estimate, however, MR has a readership of at least 25,000.

It is heartening that copies of MR are shared so widely, because the questionnaire also revealed that a good third of all our subscribers were introduced to the magazine by precisely this method. About 10 percent was attracted by direct mail advertisement. Another substantial group came from ads in the *National Guardian, The Nation,* and *I. F. Stone's Weekly;* from amalgamation with Scott Nearing's *World Events;* and from book combination offers. Also listed as introductory sources were meetings, colleges, libraries, newsstand displays, and gifts. A postman blandly informed us that he had noticed MR while making his rounds, read it between stops, and finally subscribed.

The breakdown of the origins of foreign subscriptions showed again that friends predominate. One Japanese subscriber cheered us up by saying he had heard about MR because "*Monthly Review* is famous among the Japanese."

Asked, "Have you ever gotten a new subscriber for MR?", about 25 percent of the readers said they had (thank you very much). Of these, half had given subs to friends and relatives, and some 40 percent had succeeded by the not-so-simple art of persuasion. Among foreign readers, gifts were much fewer—further evidence that Americans have all the dough.

MR Reader Preferences

Roughly half our readers in all age groups read the entire magazine. Of the regular features, the most universally read is the "Review of the Month" (91 percent) with "Notes from the Editors" a close second (89 percent).

Scott Nearing and Philip Morrison poll almost the same percentage of regular readers (75 percent) but they draw their follow-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing from different age groups. Nearing is more popular among those above 50 while Morrison appeals primarily to those under 50. Both names turned up occasionally in answers to the question, "What do you dislike about MR?", with more dislikes registered against Nearing. The only beef against Morrison was that he was sometimes hard to understand (a criticism directed also at the whole magazine), while Nearing was considered too "didactic" and "superficial." On the other hand, a number of readers rated Morrison or Nearing as by far the best feature of the magazine.

Fifty-five percent of our readers would like to have a regular book review section; 42 percent would not. The strongest demand for book reviews came from readers under 50.

Five out of six readers (84 percent) have bought at least one MR Press book. Nineteen percent of the subscribers may be described, in a phrase rarely used at the MR office, as "living dolls" because they have bought from 7 to 13 books. What *Peyton Place* is to the general public *The Empire of Oil* is to MR readers. Exactly 47 percent have bought the Harvey O'Connor book. (Unfortunately our best seller is out of print but the author is now in the Middle East, gathering material for a follow-up volume.)

Close to the top, and in order, are *The Hidden History of the Korean War, The Great Road, Man's Worldly Goods, The Present As History,* and *American Radicals* (Note: All but *The Hidden History* are still available). Among foreign subscribers *Man's Worldly Goods* shared top place with *The Hidden History,* and *The Great Road* was tied with *The Empire of Oil* for second place.

Neither income nor age has any discoverable effect on readers' book-buying. Subscribers in the top income brackets can afford to buy more books than others, but they don't. On the other hand, some low-income subscribers explained that the only reason they haven't bought books is lack of money.

Our readers listed an awesome number of other subscriptions. Here is one segment of the population in which the *National Guardian* and *The Nation* far outsell *Life, Look,* and *The Saturday Evening Post.* It is a beautiful world in which *Consumer Reports* has a circulation several times as large as *The Ladies Home Journal* and *Good Housekeeping* combined, where *U. S. News and World Report* barely rates a mention, where *The American Socialist* and *I. F. Stone's Weekly* show their heels to *Time* and *Newsweek.* The special interests represented by *The Saturday Review, Scientific American,* and *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* make them strong contenders for inclusion among the most popular magazines.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There was no end to the variety of subscriptions to other magazines. Although MR readers are primarily concerned with science, economics, and the humanities, many are interested in dance, sports, travel, stamp collecting, nature, chess, hi-fi, and even murder—if a taste for mystery thrillers may be so classified. And humor, too, as illustrated by the housewife who listed *Good Housekeeping* among her "professional" journals.

What conclusion is to be drawn from the fact that 38 percent of MR readers also subscribe to the *National Guardian*, 37½ percent to *The Nation*, 19 percent to *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, 12 percent to *The American Socialist*, and lesser percentages to every radical journal published in the United States? Surely such a large extent of duplication indicates that the Left press draws its support from the same small group of splendid and loyal men and women. The figures indicate that this sturdy band of citizens (bless them all) numbers no more than 60,000. In a nation with a population of 170 million the Left press reaches just about 1/30th of 1 percent of the people. This tells the story of radical weakness as perhaps nothing else does.

What You Don't Like

We had hoped to benefit from answers to the question "What do you dislike about MR?" and we were not disappointed. Sixty-six percent of our correspondents sent answers. One-half had complaints and suggestions, some excellent, some not so good, and some canceling each other out. We were delighted although not much enlightened by answers like this: "I dislike (1) those who do not read it; (2) those who read it and do not love it."

Many criticisms were aimed at MR's tone and level of expression. "Too intellectual," "too smug," "too pedantic," and "too academic" were typical comments. Three percent lamented the fact that MR has no connection with a political movement, and a few charged us with "a certain aloofness from problems of socialist activity." Seven percent complained of political bias, one way or another. One percent said we needed more variety.

Some of the charges have merit, and we will do our best to improve. But some of the complaints cannot be remedied easily because they arise from the fact that we have a mixed audience with different levels of learning and different approaches to the problems of the socialist movement in the United States.

The truth is, we think, that the writing in MR can rightfully be called academic or not, depending on who's reading the magazine. The worker reader who says "the writing is academic, not for working

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people" is undoubtedly correct. But the academician has no right to complain, for by comparison with the jargon of academic journals the writing in MR is simplicity itself.

We plead guilty to the charge that MR has no connection with a political movement. We don't want a connection—not at this stage of American history. We shall continue to be "an independent socialist magazine" until the time comes, if ever, when we could benefit the socialist movement by becoming associated with a political organization. But that time is not now.

We are indeed "aloof from problems of socialist activity" if that phrase means joining the Democratic Party and boring from within, or uniting the various socialist splinters into one body for a political campaign. We see nothing to be gained from either kind of activity. MR can make its most useful contribution, we feel, by offering the best analyses of current events of which we are capable, so our readers will be better equipped for socialist work in their own organizations. The one big job of socialists in the United States today is to persuade people to become socialists. This is the highest form of socialist activity, as we see it—and, brother, it ain't easy.

To those who argue (2.1 percent) that we are too pro-USSR and Stalinist, and to those others (2 percent) who call us anti-USSR and "too smug about it," we can only say that we call the shots as we see them. This, and nothing else, is the responsibility of the editors of an independent socialist magazine.

A lady from Massachusetts wrote that our articles were too long (a dozen other readers thought so, too). A few weeks later she sent a postcard saying she was uncomfortable about her complaint. "I should have said they were too long for me, but anyone studying the subject of one of those articles would want all the details. You can't please everybody."

The lady from Massachusetts is exactly right. If we tried to please everybody, we would end up by pleasing nobody. We confess to you that we don't ever try to please everybody—we try only to please ourselves, to put out a magazine that *we* like. We hope you will continue to like it, too.

BOUND VOLUME

Volume 9 of Monthly Review, which runs from May 1957 through April 1958, is complete with this issue. It contains 448 pages including an index. It will be bound, as in other years, in a beautiful wine-colored linen cloth. It will be priced at $7 and will be available in about eight weeks.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Open Letter to MR Readers From the Editors

Dear Friends:

We are proud of the sixteen books hitherto published by MR Press. It is seven years since that Sunday afternoon when we ran into I. F. Stone in Central Park and learned that his manuscript on "The Hidden History of the Korean War" had been rejected by every commercial publisher. The McCarthy era was at its height then, and we published the Stone book and the others that followed, in defiance of a publishers' boycott of first-rate Left books. Our books do not ordinarily get reviewed in the commercial press, but because you have supported our venture, they DO get published, and they do get translated into many other languages.

We are about to bring out what in many ways is our most important book. It is "The Wall Between" by Anne Braden.

MR readers will remember "the Braden case"—the trial and imprisonment of Carl Braden which followed upon the Bradens buying a house in a white Louisville, Kentucky, suburb and selling it to their Negro friend Andrew Wade.

The dramatic story of that case forms the framework of Anne Braden's book. But it is only the framework. The author probes beneath the headlines and perceptively opens up to us the fears, the dreams, the lives of the people involved—the people who live in the shadows on either side of the Wall of segregation; the people, white and Negro, whose spirits are confined and warped by racial bars.

We sent the manuscript to our book editor, a man of high literary standards not given to easy enthusiasms. Unprecedentedly, after he had read the first fifty pages, he wrote us:

> She tells you things you already know in a way which hits you in the teeth, and gives you that shudder which Melville (wasn't it?) called "the shock of recognition." And she tells you things you don't know in a way which brings you a quiet revelation, illumination.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It will certainly be one of the books that any competent historian or sociologist, American or foreign, writing in 1975 or 1980, will have to examine very closely as a fundamental source.

We think of "The Wall Between" as perhaps the most important book we have ever published because it is so sensitively written, with so much understanding of why people behave as they do, that it will move hitherto unpersuaded people to see the light. In short, this book is a weapon in the struggle to make the walls of segregation come tumbling down.

We are publishing it, appropriately, on July 14, when the walls of the Bastille were breached. On publication day it will cost $5. Until then, you can buy it at the prepublication price of $3. If you want to save still another dollar, you can order the book with a renewal of your sub—both for $6. Renewals will, of course, begin with the expiration date of your sub so it doesn't matter how far ahead you already are. This combination offer, at the $6 price, holds only until publication day.

We hope you will order quickly—while we are still in the galley-proof stage—so that we can make the press run for "The Wall Between" the largest in MR Press history.

Bound books will be off the press around June 15th. Those who order at the prepublication price will get their books soon after.

Suggested order form

Monthly Review Press 66 Barrow Street New York 14, N. Y.

☐ I enclose $..... for ..... copies of "The Wall Between" at the prepublication price of $3 per copy.

☐ I enclose $6 for the combination offer of the Braden book plus a renewal of my sub.

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES ON THE FUTURE OF COMMUNISM IN INDIA

BY NAOMI MITCHISON

If democracy, as we think of it in the West, is to function, it has to have a certain form and a certain pace. The pace must be fast enough to give people the feeling that they are getting somewhere. Start slowing it down and it wobbles like a bicycle. For its form it must have two parties. It can have more, but too many small groups pulling different ways cancel one another out and slow the pace. When there is only one effective party, or if one party stays in power too long and seems immovable, then we begin to shake our heads.

Of course, ours is not the only kind of democracy, though we are apt to assume that it is, and all the modern ones are far enough from the democracy of ancient Athens where it was first thought of. But I think that in India most people would believe in more or less our form of parliamentary representative government being the democratic form. But there are difficulties.

The Congress Party came into existence in India as the weapon for freedom. Self rule, freedom, these were the magic words, and people gave themselves selflessly and generously. Then the thing that had been struggled for came true; if the British Labor Party had nothing else to its credit, it would still have the freeing of India, even with all the misery of partition wished into history by earlier British administrations. Immediately after 1947, a number of people started wearing Congress caps, and a number of organizations which had never cared for risky pronouncements decided that they were Congress supporters. There are still some great and noble men and women in the Indian Congress Party, but they are bound to see the pace slowing and the vested interests within the party hardening.

The Indian government has made and largely carried out far more detailed plans than any other democratic government; it has not been afraid to consult scientists and statisticians, nonpolitical experts, and to take their advice in detail. Some governments do this for war purposes; India does it for peace. But what has been missing

---

Naomi Mitchison, the well-known Scots novelist, recently returned home from a trip to India where, among other things, she visited her famous brother J. B. S. Haldane, who announced last year that he was emigrating to India.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is another party, an effective and genuine opposition, with recognizable ideals which could appeal to both the hearts and heads of a weighty section of the public: an opposition which can put the party in power on its mettle and, if it has hardened and slowed down, bring it life.

There have been various communal groups that have opposed Congress, with group or religious backing. These may be very powerful, but they have a very narrow and sometimes hideously cruel point of view which may make them mass parties in one state or another, but not, one hopes and believes, general parties. There are also small socialist opposition parties. But Congress would call itself socialist and is, in a rather Fabian way, since it has done away with some kinds of landlordism, especially the very artificial kind introduced by the British, who thought they were supporting kindly lords of the manor but were actually supporting a class of absentee money-suckers. It has also done some redistribution of the national income, has enlarged the public sector of industry, and concentrated as far as possible on the welfare of the villages. But India cannot afford to antagonize the non-socialist countries too much, and there are still great riches and power in private hands in spite of the taxation on wealth.

But there is now one serious opposition party which has actually taken over the government after a hotly contested election in the state of Kerala. This is the Indian Communist Party.

Kerala is a small state as Indian states go, only forty million or so people, mostly poor; one of its main exports is, inevitably, manpower and one finds hard working Kerala people all over India—and for that matter East Africa. It is a beautiful and attractive country; there is quite a high rainfall on the southwest coast of India and, to one coming from the dry east, everything seems very green and luxuriant. One goes down the coast road from prosperous Cochin, among coconut palms, rice, bananas, tapioca plants, pepper vines, cashew nut plantations, sugar cane, and all kinds of vegetables and spices. Higher up there are rubber trees and above them tea and coffee plantations. The fishermen spread spidery nets to dry. One realizes after a time that the whole place is packed with holdings, not clustered into villages, but jammed together, each family hut in its own few acres of land, at a population density of two thousand to the square mile. Most of the people in the huts are small tenants, very much at the landlord's mercy, eating tapioca as a staple diet and selling whatever they can. It is official Congress policy to limit the size of holdings, but many states have done very little about it. Now the new government of Kerala is getting busy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet the Agrarian Act is not very radical. It provides for the compulsory sale of land where there is an excess over the fifteen acres which seems enough, in Kerala, to give a living for a family. But there are any amount of exceptions, which include the tea and coffee plantations. This land is not, however, going to be nationalized in our sense. It is going back to the small tenants; anything over will go to the millions of landless agricultural laborers. A side result will be to stop speculation in land which has, in the towns, made it very difficult for the small man to start a business. So it seems as though the proletariat to which the good Marxists of Kerala want to give power will be a proletariat of small landowners. This is a situation which Marx and Engels never envisaged and for which there are no rules, though Chinese experience may begin to provide some.

Had the Kerala government been completely Communist, no doubt things might be different, more violent perhaps but the results quicker. But it is a government working within the framework of the Indian constitution. In fact it is a Communist Party, not a Communist government.

I had a talk with the Chief Minister, Mr. Namboodiripad—his friends know him by initials—who is a Brahmin, has had many terms of imprisonment, has a rather endearing stammer and a benevolent face. He talked enthusiastically of how once the sheer poverty which drives people to cruelty and greed is over, peasant cooperatives would start. He was also most genuinely anxious to clean up the administration, which, under the late Congress government, was rotten with corruption and inefficiency. In fact, the Communists were probably elected, in part at least, as a protest against that. It will be difficult to cope with, but Mr. Namboodiripad knew that people would judge him and his party by whether or not they managed it. It was clear to me that the Chief Minister was a humanist, determined never to lose touch with the common people, and with a gentle but firm confidence. He said to me—and I think he was right—that western observers cannot see anything but Russian forms of Communism. For himself, he was more interested in Chinese, and perhaps Bulgarian, methods. But he wished we would try to judge Indian Communism as something on its own.

The other member of the government with whom I talked was the Minister of Education, Mr. Mundassery, a Roman Catholic in this oddly diverse set of enthusiasts. His Education Act, which calls for increasing secularization of the schools, state appointments of teachers, and a more practical and scientific curriculum, is being hotly fought. His main enemies are the Christian churches of Kerala. Now, south India was proselytized at a time when most of our north-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

west European ancestors were still ramping around with the Druids. But it cannot be said to have moved on. There is no liberal church, either among the Catholics or among the Syrians. When the British were the Establishment, the Kerala churches were pro-British. Now that Congress is the Establishment, they are pro-Congress. And, for obvious reasons, they are against scientific teaching. They like to keep a firm grip on their congregations, and the scientific outlook does not allow for that.

I noticed one interesting thing. Mr. Mundassery spoke with genuine enthusiasm and love for Gandhi, whom he thought of with a living respect which is something rather different from the formal homage which one is apt to find in modern India. In fact, the Kerala Minister of Education obviously feels himself in the direct and correct line, not only of Marxist, but of Gandhian thought. If this sounds impossible, I must only repeat that we should judge Indian Communism on its own and not as something out of Russia.

It is not going to be at all easy for the Kerala government, and in a few years they will have to fight another general election, which they may lose. Doubtless they are doing a lot of propaganda, but so are the other parties, including the socialist parties. India is a land where it seems possible still to publish a number of newspapers, none of them with an enormous circulation. Kerala has several Communist papers, though at the railway station I wasn't able to buy any of them but only an opposition one! The literacy rate in Kerala is high, though some of the pupils at church schools have not always got much beyond elementary religious manuals. Under the new Education Act it might go up to nearly a hundred percent.

What does the rest of India think about this? My feeling is that they are watching what they call the Kerala experiment with genuine interest and often sympathy. The word "Communist" doesn't frighten them. They see no horns and tail. And many thinking people are aware that the pace of things under Congress governments is not fast enough for what must be done, does not even catch up with the growth of poverty which follows the pressure of population on resources, which is still unchecked at the village level, although so many of the big-family babies die before they are five.

Part of this may be due to a certain inertia in the civil service, a hangover from British rule when social change was not encouraged. Part is perhaps that in the enormous structure of the Congress Party, the kind of young politician who gets a move on, the normal "left wing" of most existing parties, is choked out in a series of shifts and compromises and election promises. There is no place for him—or her.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So long as Nehru is there, Congress will hang together. Nor have I ever heard any real criticism of the great Prime Minister from the Communist side. But afterwards?

It seems to me very probable that sooner or later India as a whole will have a Communist Party government in power. If she does, I hope and trust that we in Great Britain and still more you in the United States will have the sense not to run screaming, but to accept the will of the people of India and deal at least as fairly with this government as we would with any other.

For it will not be like the Communist government in the Soviet Union or even in China, where they had to take power the hard and cruel way. If they come in, they will have been elected by ordinary adult suffrage. More important: the Indian Communist Party have now decided that, in the event of their getting power, they would envisage a situation with an opposition party, not only for the sake of democratic shape and reality, but also to keep them, as an organization, on their toes.

They also envisage other publishing houses besides state or party ones. That is to say, they envisage a Communist Party government continuing with our most cherished western freedoms: freedom of opinion and of publication. They are also in favor of allowing some private sectors in industry, though no monopolies, and the powers of the private capitalist—the "man-eating tiger" of the current Indian cartoons—would be firmly restricted. In this they go little if at all further than the British Labor Party. But they have one thing in their favor. India is still an undeveloped country. It would be simple for all major industrialization to be under some kind of public management. In fact, most thinking Indians would agree that this must be the right course. Only a few man-eating tigers would dissent.

I think that all Indian Communists would stress the importance of education. At present it may well be that there are more real differences between Communist workers or peasant leaders, often speaking only their national languages and possibly not fully literate even in those, and their comrades, the middle-class intellectual leaders, than there are between Communist intellectuals and Congress intellectuals. Only education can bridge the gulf between the "two nations." Meanwhile they may well differ on priorities, as well as having different inner feelings. I think that most of the intellectuals would feel that, though English cannot possibly be the national language of India, it should be retained, as one of them expressed it to me, "as the language of comprehension," a necessity for scientists and technicians, but not, as it is now, a hide-out for PhDs in "English literature."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They also have strong views about bringing out the women, who are still, in spite of some brilliant exceptions, notably in politics, underprivileged in India, overworked and underfed in the villages, treated as dolls or children in the richer classes where they are living examples of the theory of conspicuous expenditure. Yet I do not think that their views are very different from those held by most progressive Indians. The Communists too feel that family planning is an absolute necessity, but they cannot, any more than anyone else, see how to get it into the villages.

As to religious freedom, no political party wanting mass support could possibly touch on religion in India. After all, the first question likely to be asked at local party headquarters is: "What is the caste of your candidate?" Nor is religion in India the simple matter of Moslems or Hindus, Brahmins or non-Brahmins, that we are so apt to believe it is. There is a network of sub-castes and social divisions, living in apparent amity in some places but at each others' throats in other places. Where, as in Kerala, there is an indigenous Christian church, it has become Hinduized, not only in the cheerful sense of decorating churches and steeples so that they look like another kind of many-Godded temple, but also in the sense that there are "backward Christians," untouchables who have been converted but not really accepted. It is against that background that one must consider the degree of secularization of education proposed by Mr. Mundassery in Kerala.

The official Communist Party documents in English have the usual stock phrases and cast blame on the imperialist powers as well as on Congress for whatever is going wrong. But Party people are more than friendly towards individuals from Western countries and would certainly welcome the advent of a Labor government in Great Britain. For there are still very strong bonds of history and perhaps I may say affection, between India and her old enemy. Like everyone else in the world, they know that peace is the first essential. The sense of fear and insecurity is not so strong here as in Great Britain where we are really upset at the idea of becoming an expendable base for any more NATO bombers. India might not be blotted out, as we would be, but might be almost as seriously affected by a world fallout of radioactive dust.

Now, what all this comes to is that the Indian Communist Party is gradually altering its nature, as institutions always must if they are alive. They criticize—and how rightly!—Western Communist parties for their rigidity, above all for their following the Russian line so completely over events in Hungary. I think the Indians sympathize very deeply with the Hungarians over the whole shocking business

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the crushing of their national pride and honor. The same kind of thing had happened in India. They look with intense interest at Poland and also, no doubt, at whatever may be happening in Outer Mongolia and Tibet.

They are beginning to have experience of the difficulties of administration and the necessity for a democratic base on which to build. It may be that in India we will one day see what has never been seen: a democratic Communist Party in power.

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Picking Up the Pieces

"Permanent prosperity" melted away after five years in the early months of 1929. It was replaced by the Great Depression, which lasted until 1940.

"Permanent boom" ended in the closing months of 1957, three years after the brief 1953-1954 recession and depression. In its place is the yawning abyss of layoffs, part-time work, shutdowns, and the desperate search by healthy, willing, competent women and men for jobs that will yield them a living.

This is neither the time nor the place to repeat business cycle history. But we should remind ourselves that every few years, from 1790 to 1907, private enterprise business in the United States slipped and shambled from prosperity through recession, depression, and revival, then back to another brief and insecure period of prosperity. Nor is it necessary to dwell on the fact that every people (whether in the Americas, Europe, or Asia) which has put its trust in the stability and security of private business enterprise has been periodically disappointed and betrayed. These facts are part of history. They

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot be explained away. We ignore them at our peril.

Neither is this the time or place to repeat the story of the recent boom—built on the profligate waste of natural resources, with its widening gap between national product and consumer spending, its immense card-house of public and private debt, its persistent reduction in the buying power of currency, and its blood-drenched prosperity, based on arms spending and the mass destructiveness and devastation of mechanized warfare.

Repeatedly, in these notes on World Events, we have called attention to the basic unsoundness of the ferocious, suicidal, dog-eat-dog struggle for wealth and power into which otherwise sane humans in North America and Western Europe have poured their aspirations, their hopes, their energies, their health, and finally their lives during the generations when the West was conquering, plundering, and exploiting the natural resources and manpower of the planet.

Again and again, over the past two centuries, men in public life and their economist-henchmen have assured their dupes and victims that they have found the touchstone which will yield something for nothing in a paradise of unearned income, knicknacks, gadgets, and jimcracks. Some of these shepherds were ignorant, others were short-sighted. Still others had sold their brains in the wage-slave market and were writing and talking what they were paid to write and teach.

Sometimes the wheels of the gods grind slowly. Sometimes they speed up in a series of events which pour pell-mell through a community, tearing its life into shreds and tatters. Such a speed-up of history has produced the Great Revolution of the past few decades which has engulfed the system of private enterprise economy as easily as it wiped out the structure of imperialism-colonialism built by the private enterprisers after 1500 A.D.

Month by month we have been pointing out to our readers that prosperity, stability, and security could be assured only through co-existence, cooperation, mutual aid, forbearance, magnanimity, understanding, and sympathy, tempered by a devotion to justice and a patient search for workable methods of handling the contradictions and tensions which fill the lives of individuals and communities. A few have read and believed our interpretation of current trends. Most have passed us by or, if they noticed us at all, have scoffed "egg head" or sneered "crack-pot."

Beginning with the autumn of 1957, the wheels have ground out their economic grist. Instead of giving "something for nothing," private enterprise business has again reached a point where it gives

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"nothing for nothing." This applies particularly to those who live closest to the economic margin, but as we should have learned during the current world-wide overturn, the highly placed also lose their palaces, their shirts, and often their lives.

Perhaps we can point up the main issues in a few paragraphs:

(1) About 1907 the private enterprise economy of the United States passed out of its phase of periodic recession and depression into its stage of chronic or permanent depression. All aspects of the economy were not similarly blighted at first. Old industries like textiles, shipbuilding, and soft coal felt the shock first. For a time the new industries such as autos, electric gadgets, and radio were exempt. But from 1929 to 1939, the entire United States economy was sucked into the abyss of permanent depression. What was true of the United States was generally true of the entire private enterprise world.

(2) Japanese leaders were the first to discover a way out of this impasse. They expanded armament production and speeded up the conquest and occupation of Manchuria and then of China. Japanese economy scarcely suffered from the Great Depression. By 1932 it had regained its momentum. Italian and German experience underscores the same lesson: at a certain stage in its decline, private enterprise economy can be pulled out of chronic depression by expanded government expenditures, preferably for armament and war.

(3) Depression in the United States lasted from 1929 to 1939. This was the normal state of an over-expanded, over-equipped economy. The boom which began in 1940 was a war boom, sparked by war in Spain, war in Europe, war across the world (1940-1945), and, after 1945, war in Indo-China, Korea, and other colonial areas.

(4) Surplus productive capacity, which played such havoc from 1929 to 1939, had been latent in United States economy since the slump of 1907. It did not appear on the surface because of the wars which began in 1911. During the past decade, productive capacity has been vastly increased by capital investments which reached a level of some $50 billion per year in 1956 and 1957.

(5) Today the United States economy is badly crippled. It produced about $440 billion in goods and services in 1957. Consumers bought about $280 billion, leaving a gap of about $160 billion. In 1929 the gap between total product and consumer spending was only $24 billion. Today it is six and a half times that figure. This gap was filled in 1957 by reinvestment of $50 billion and by government spending of more than $100 billion. Government spending in the United States for goods and services was $8.5 billion in 1929 and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$82 billion in 1957. While gross national product increased slightly more than four times, government spending grew to ten times its 1929 figure.

(6) Private enterprise in the United States is bankrupt. Left to itself, it would operate at from 70 to 80 percent of the present level. This would mean an unemployment figure of well over 15 million. It is government spending and government spending alone which hides the bankruptcy of the United States private enterprise economy.

During the Great Depression of the 1930s the Hoover-Roosevelt Reconstruction Finance Corporation shoveled billions from the federal treasury into the bankrupt private enterprise system. The same process of government subsidy to save a bankrupt private enterprise economy now takes the major form of arms spending at a rate of $40 to $50 billion per year.

(7) If private enterprise is bankrupt in the United States, and without extensive subsidy would be flat on its back, it is even flatter in Europe, despite the billions in subsidies which Washington has been pouring into European economies for the past two decades.

(8) What is the Washington administration proposing in February and March, 1958, to cover up the bankruptcy of private enterprise? You have the answer in President Eisenhower's public statements of February 12 and February 24—an expanded program of government spending, even though this handout must be paid for by raising the debt limit, running a budget deficit, and forcing up the price level. The Eisenhower formula is "anything and everything to save private enterprise," in its frantic efforts to make a bankrupt economy function as though it were solvent. The President and Congress are saying, in effect, private enterprise cannot save itself; government subsidy alone can save it.

(9) There is one way out of this situation, and only one: another general war, which will surely be fought with atomic and nuclear weapons and may well result in the annihilation of the human race. At the very least such a war will mark the end of private enterprise.

The dog-eat-dog struggle for wealth and power (capitalism, private business enterprise, imperialism-colonialism, the American Way, Western civilization) has had its day and run its course during the past four centuries. Since 1914 it has been devoting its energies to a salutary process of self-destruction. Nature works that way. Waste breeds corruption. Carrion, the end product of corruption, is reabsorbed by Mother Earth and converted into plant food. With the coming of spring, plant food produces beautiful flowers and luscious

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fruits. Social processes will parallel natural sequences as the outmoded, insolvent private enterprise economy is crowded and pushed from the key position which it has occupied these many years as the arbiter and master of world history.

Young Socialist Cities

Young Soviet cities, like Soviet children and young Communists, are a second-generation product. Old Russian cities such as Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev have been rebuilt in part, but the new building is done against the background of an old city. New-born socialist cities are in a class by themselves. One of the most impressive of these new cities is located about 25 miles from Baku, on the shores of the Caspian Sea. It is named Sumgait.

Baku's prosperity for the past eighty years has been built on oil. In its early stage the oil industry was dominated by British capital. After the Revolution, oil production was given top priority by the Soviet authorities.

Baku's population has increased from 250,000 in 1920 to about a million in 1958. As socialist construction has progressed, old Baku has been converted into a modern metropolis, with broad, well-paved streets, tree-lined, with parks, fine public buildings, and an extensive program of home building.

Oil production requires a large supply of metal piping and elaborate mechanical equipment for pumping and refining the natural oil. "We went over the problem carefully," one of our informants said. "Then we made two decisions. One was to produce our own pipe locally, from our own local iron ore, and thus avoid the high cost of bringing in pipe from the Urals. The second decision was not to crowd the very extensive pipe mill needed to meet our needs into the city of Baku, which was already badly congested. So we picked out a site on the shore of the Caspian, 25 miles from Baku, and went to work clearing up the desert and laying foundations."

Soon it was apparent that there would be a shortage of electric power in the new city. After long discussion it was decided to put a dam and a power station in the nearby river and to carry the newly developed power to Sumgait. The power station was planned and constructed. The power was wired to Sumgait. Around the power station a second socialist city is growing.

In addition to the immense pipe mill, largely mechanized, the socialist builders laid out a machine-building plant capable of turning out the machinery required by the rapidly growing pipe plant.

When we visited Sumgait in November, 1957, it was a city of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

60,000, with broad streets, splendid public buildings, and miles of apartment houses. Most of the construction work had been done in the previous five years. These new products of socialism form part of an industrial and urban complex, radiating out from Baku.

Four decades of planned construction have produced socialist children and socialist cities. Both have turned their backs on the past. Both face confidently toward a socialist future.

Cranes At Work

Perhaps the most obvious aspect of Soviet economy is the cranes at work on construction projects. We expect to see cranes on United States construction jobs. We have also grown used to them in Canada, Germany, and Great Britain. Outside of a handful of countries, however, construction cranes are unusual. In India and neighboring Asian countries, they are nearly nonexistent. Buildings are constructed from scaffoldings built of poles and lashed together with ropes and wires.

Imagine our surprise and delight on entering the Soviet Union last November to find that the old scaffoldings which had been in use twenty years before, on our last visit, were a thing of the past. On every construction job involving more than two stories, cranes were at work. We use the plural of crane advisedly. There were cranes everywhere.

Out in the Lenin Hills, near the University, many apartments are under construction. In height they vary from five or six to ten or twelve stories. Each job is literally encircled by cranes. On one moderately large operation we counted fourteen cranes, each able to function at a maximum height of about 12 stories. In a matter of a mile or so along the avenue leading from the airport to the city we counted over one hundred construction cranes.

Building construction, by common consent, is one of the indicators of economic health. If this measure of economic well-being is accepted, Soviet economy is bursting with vigor. Building is going on everywhere in the Soviet Union, and everywhere building construction is mechanized.

Along United States highways signs warn of "men at work." For Soviet construction jobs, the appropriate sign would be "cranes at work."

Economic Notes from China

Since United States citizens have no practicable means of getting first-hand reports from Peoples' China, a summary of some news items might pass on to them the feeling of innovation and upsurge which dominates Chinese economy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Construction workers are putting the finishing touches on a huge 28-shop plant in Wuhan, on the Yangtse River. The plant is designed to build the machines required by heavy industry. Scheduled for completion by the autumn of 1958, some of the shops were turning out products in December 1957. Eighty to eighty-five percent of the machinery installed in the Wuhan plant was made in China. The balance came from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Poland, East Germany, and the Soviet Union. So far as we could learn, not a micrometer or a pair of pliers came from the United States.

Chang Chin-yung, a Nanking foundry worker, completed his self-determined ten year quota of castings in five years. In the more than ten thousand casts he made, only seven were rejected. Chang practiced strict economy and never threw away even a crooked or rusty nail. He is thirty years of age and has worked in the foundry for seventeen years.

Chinese engineers, with technical advice and assistance from their Soviet colleagues, are building a steel city in Inner Mongolia at the junction of the Peking-Paotow and the Paotow-Lanchow railways. The largest blast and open-hearth furnaces in China, which are being erected on the site, will go into production in 1960 and 1962. Paotow has everything that it takes to build a modern iron and steel base: high-grade iron ore, coking coal, impervious clay, quartzite, dolomite and flux, good railway connections, and a large agricultural area to absorb quantities of tools and machines.

Ten thousand miners of East China and their families have moved into new homes in 1957, according to the administrative bureau of the Ministry of the Coal Industry. Schools, nurseries, public dining halls, post offices, and department stores have also been set up in the new residential quarters to serve the miners.

Any society which pins its hope of survival upon its technical ability to massacre scores of millions of the enemy's innocent noncombatants, which is at the same time reckless of its responsibility for poisoning, in the name of self-defense, the atmosphere and food-bearing soil of the whole earth, has accepted a moral degradation which denies it any title to freedom within itself. It has accepted a brutalization of its foreign policy which must inevitably brutalize and poison its internal life as well. It has taken a position which necessarily undermines all its highest protestations on the world stage, and at the same time undermines—as did the slaughters at Hiroshima and Nagasaki—all its most deeply held beliefs.

—Walter Millis, *New York Times Magazine,* February 2, 1958

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IX

Author	*Title*	*No.*	*Page*
Adler, Solomon	*Imperial Germany And The Industrial Revolution—A Review*	3-4	76
	Some Impressions Of China's Economic Progress: Part One	9	304
	Part Two	10	340
Baran, Paul A.	*The Theory Of The Leisure Class—A Review*	3-4	83
Bettelheim, Charles	*The Common Market*	1	5
Brand, George	*The Strange Powers Of The Senate*	9	282
Brockway, Fenner	*The South African Treason Trial—A Review*	11	392
Clark, Joseph	*The Great Divide*	7	216
Crosby, Alexander S.	*The Lolling Masses*	11	375
Davis, Arthur K.	*The Postwar Essays—A Review*	3-4	91
Dunham, Barrows	*Maxims Moral And Political*	9	294
	The Young Guardians: A Hint From Plato	2	52
Editors, The	*Where We Stand*	1	24
	Who You Are	12	426
Fedotov, D.	*The Soviet View Of Psychoanalysis*	8	249
Goldberg, Harvey	*French Socialism At The Crossroads*	11	386
Huberman, Leo	*Report From Japan*	2	45
Kosambi, D. D.	*Notes On The Revolution In China*	6	193
Kubie, Lawrence S.	*Pavlov, Freud, And Soviet Psychiatry*	11	359
Martinet, Gilles	*A Left-Wing French View Of Israel And Egypt*	1	17
Mitchison, Naomi	*Notes On The Future Of Communism In India*	12	434
Moore, Stanley	*The Political Economy Of Growth: A Review*	1	11
Morrison, Philip	*The Place Of Science In Modern Civilization—A Review*	3-4	99
	The World Of Science	7, 9, 11	
Nearing, Scott	*World Events*	(In every issue)	
O'Connor, Harvey	*Dividends To The Nation*	5	160
Reider, Norman	*A Psychoanalyst Replies*	8	254
Review Of The Month	*Behind The FCC Scandal*	12	401
	Forty Years After	7	209
	India, China, And Freedom	9	273
	Slump And Cold War	10	321
	The Economic Situation	1	1
	The Facts Of Life	11	353
	The Meaning Of Little Rock	8	241

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Author	Title	No.	Page
	The Role Of The Supreme Court	5	129
	Thorstein Bunde Veblen, 1857-1957	3-4	65
	What Every American Should Know About Jordan	2	33
	Which Way For The Soviet Union?	6	177
Snow, Edgar	*The "Passing Phase" In China—A Review*	6	185
	War-War Or Jaw-Jaw?	12	412
Supreme Court, The	*Opinions In The Sweezy Case*	5	137
Sweezy, Paul M.	*Poland A Year After*	9	289
	Socialism In Europe, East And West	10	328
	The Theory Of Business Enterprise And Absentee Ownership—A Review	3-4	105
	The Yugoslav Experiment	11	362
Tsuru, Shigeto	*Strachey And Capitalism—A Review*	8	259
Veblen, Thorstein B.	*Quotations from,*	5	171
		9	315
	Special issue on,	3-4	
	Articles by		
	The Editors — *Philip Morrison*		
	Solomon Adler — *Paul M. Sweezy*		
	Paul A. Baran — *William A. Williams*		
	Arthur K. Davis — *H. H. Wilson*		
Williams, William A.	*Soviet Conduct And American Policy*	5	151
	The Nature Of Peace—A Review	3-4	112
Wilson, H. H.	*The Higher Learning In America—A Review*	3-4	117
The World Of Science by Philip Morrison	*Automation—A Review*	11	380
	Spider Webs, Drugs, And The Nature Of Man	7	227
	The Sputniki	9	296
World Events by Scott Nearing		(In every issue)	
Zilliacus, Konni	*The Labor Party Faces Power*	7	219

(*continued from inside back cover*)

write to Friends and Neighbors of David Hyun, Box 26026, Los Angeles 26, California.

MR readers will be glad to know that *The Big Boxcar,* the exciting novel about race relations in the South by Alfred Maund, is now out in a paperback edition (Ballantine Books, 35¢). Alf Maund, who has written for MR in the past and we hope will again in the future, is now public relations director and editor for the International Chemical Workers Union with headquarters in Akron, Ohio.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

bination book and sub offers, see the announcement on page 432.

We were gratified to receive a letter from one of Yugoslavia's leading economists in regard to Paul Sweezy's article "The Yugoslav Experiment" which appeared in last month's issue. "I think it is very well done," our correspondent writes, "and what is also important very honestly written. May be that some details, like the description of the investment mechanism, are not quite accurate, but more in a technical than in a fundamental sense. I believe that your goodwill criticisms will be welcomed in current discussions about the Yugoslav economic system."

The March issue of *The American Economic Review* carries a long review of Paul Baran's *Political Economy of Growth* by Nicholas Kaldor, well known British economist. We specially liked the following: "Its racy style, its sustained and often brilliant invective, its indignant temper, its tendency to make far-reaching generalizations on insufficient and selected evidence, its capacity to pose important questions, is each so reminiscent of the great founder of Marxism that it might well be hailed as a present day version of *Das Kapital.*" To which we would add the comment from the British left-Labor weekly *Tribune* that "this book is a very important contribution to socialist theory. It is Marxist, but it goes beyond Marx." The book, incidentally, is now in its second printing. If you don't own it yet, you owe it to yourself to place your order immediately. Price $5, or $7 in combination with a one-year sub to MR.

Usually we are in the position of asking you for money. Now, however, we are going to tell you how to get money. All you need to be is a scholar with a first-rate project for studying one or more "problems posed by Marxist theory and its application." If you fit the description and need a grant (normal amounts $500 to $3000) to help you in your work, write to the Corresponding Secretary, The Fund for Social Analysis, Room 2800, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y., who will furnish you with the necessary information for making an application. The establishment of this Fund will, we hope, go some way toward making available to left-wing social scientists the kind of financial assistance which the big foundations have always refused them.

Some gremlin crept into the office last month and changed the title of Dr. Lawrence Kubie's article, which should have been "Pavlov, Freud, and Soviet *Psychiatry*" (instead of *Psychology*). We trust that no readers were misled into wrongly interpreting Dr. Kubie's meaning. To Dr. Kubie go our apologies.

Another correction concerns the ad for Lawrence Fernsworth's book *Spain's Struggle for Freedom* which appeared on the back cover of the February issue. Mr. Fernsworth writes: "It was an error to have said [as the advertiser stated in the ad] that the reason the *New York Times* and I parted company in the Spanish Civil War period was that it declined to print the truth about Spain. It in fact printed about 99 percent of my news reports—but some of these reports were deliberately blocked in the Paris office before ever reaching the *New York Times.*"

If any MR readers have direct knowledge, based either on personal observation or interviews with Asians immediately concerned, of physical repression in South Korea, they can be of great assistance to the defense in the David Hyun deportation case. What is required is sworn affidavits which can be presented as evidence to prove that David Hyun faces persecution and possible death if he is sent back into the clutches of his old enemy Syngman Rhee. The deportation hearing at which these affidavits will be presented is scheduled for July 28th. If you can help, or want further information, please

(*continued on page* 448)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR ASSOCIATES

is honored to present

as the featured speaker at its 9th Anniversary Meeting

on the topic

Other Speakers:

LEO HUBERMAN: *The Labor Situation*

PAUL M. SWEEZY: *The State of the Economy*

Chairman: PROF. C. WRIGHT MILLS

Date: TUESDAY, MAY 27, 8:30 P.M. Sharp

Place: ROOSEVELT AUDITORIUM, 100 East 17 St. NYC

Admission: $1 in advance . . . $1.50 at the door . . .
Associates, free

We anticipate an overflow meeting. Order your tickets now.

suggested order form

Monthly Review Associates 66 Barrow Street New York 14, N.Y.

I enclose $..... for ..... tickets at $1 each to the May 27th meeting.

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

☐ I am an Associate for 1957-1958.
Please send me my free ticket for the meeting.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED